

### REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. Claims 1-44 stand provisionally rejected under the judicial-doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting based on co-pending Application No. 08/766,607. Claims 1-44 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Wilska in view of Takahara. Reconsideration and further consideration are respectfully requested.

#### Regarding Double Patenting Rejection

The Applicants again request that the double patenting rejection be placed in abeyance until the claims are otherwise allowed.

#### Regarding Rejections Under Section 112

Although the separation of the light source from the control circuit is supported by at least FIG. 2C of the application, the claims have been amended to remove that limitation.

#### Regarding Rejections Under Section 103

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are traversed. At issue remains the teachings of Takahara.

As claimed, the Applicants employ a power management circuit to lower the power consumption of a control circuit. As claimed, the control circuit receives image data and generates display data based on the image data. The display data is provided to a matrix LCD by the control circuit for presenting an image. The image is illuminated by a light source after which the power management circuit lowers the power consumption of the control circuit until the next image from the control circuit is ready to be presented to the matrix display.

As expressly recited, the Applicants' claimed power management circuit affects the control circuit. That limitation is recited in all claims.

Takahara, in contrast, does nothing to affect a control circuit. Instead Takahara reduces the power consumption of its light source. The light source is different from the control circuit, both in the Applicants' claims and in Takahara.

As explained by Takahara, "the power consumption of a viewfinder employing on LCD panel amounts up to 1.1 W" of which 1.0 W is consumed by the light source power. (Col. 5, 11. 12-16.) This is because fluorescent tubes having a heater voltage of 2.5 V and an anode voltage of 18 V are used for the light source. Takahara therefore seeks to lower the power consumption of the light emitting tubes. These light emitting tubes do not receive image data and generate display data, as required by the Applicants' control circuit.

Takahara modulates the anode voltage with a pulse signal, which cycles at 60 Hz. By varying the pulse width, the quantity of emitted light can be varied proportionately. Using a 50% pulse width, the power consumption of the light emitting tube is said to be reduced to 0.25 W. Adding in the power consumption of the LCD (0.1 W) brings the power to "slightly greater than 0.3 W. (Col. 31, 1. 62.)

Although Takahara expressly reduces the power consumption of the light emitting tubes, the Office Action asserts that the control circuit is impacted. Indeed, the Office Action asserts that the "Light Emitting Tube Power Supply Circuit" (Fig. 22, ref. 223) lowers the power to the "Reproduction Circuit" (Fig. 22, ref. 225). As suggest by its name, and discussed in the detailed description, the "Light Emitting Tube Power Supply Circuit" supplies power to the light emitting tube (Fig. 22, ref. 211). It does not receive image data from the telephone and generate display data, as required by the Applicants' claimed control data. The Office Action is clearly in error.

The Office Action attempts to argue that Takahara's light source is part of a circuit, and that by reducing power consumption of the light source, the power consumption of the circuit is reduced. That argument ignores the limitations in the claims. The Applicants do not claim an electrical circuit, but a control circuit. In addition, the control circuit and the light source are recited as distinct elements. According to the claims, reducing power consumption of the light source would not necessarily affect the power consumption of the control circuit.

Furthermore, while the light source may be part of an electrical circuit, it does not control anything. It merely responds to a voltage by generating light. The light source is therefore

controlled by a control circuit. The light source is not itself part of any control circuit, as claimed by the Applicants.

To further distinguish the control circuit from the light source, the claims have been amended to recite that the control circuit is a processing circuit, which can be in a central processing unit (Claims 24 and 38). As such, the claims further define the control circuit as more than an electrical circuit. This amendment is not an acquiesce to the rejections, which are traversed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S. C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If a telephone conference could expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Rodney D. Johnson

Registration No. 36,558

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

*August 23, 2008*